



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

positions of Moses' death, as is the case in the Jewish and Christian "Assumptio" but he keeps strictly to the Biblical words, which he explains according to the Samaritan tradition and belief. He says nothing about Moses' dialogue with the Angel of Death, nor of the fight of the archangel Michael with Satan for the corpse of the Prophet. Marqah seems, according to Dr. Munk, to have known the "Assumptio," against which he argues.

Besides its value for Samaritan exegesis, which is still very imperfectly known, the text of Marqah is of importance for Samaritan philology as well as for the vocabulary. Dr. Munk's edition is accompanied by a good German translation and short notes, which contain explanations of unusual words as well as exegetical matter. Here we find also the strange name *לומד* for the letter *lomed*. This name must have arisen from another source than Dr. Munk thinks, viz., the interchange of kindred consonants.

A. NEUBAUER.

Die Nominalbildungen in der Mischnah. Von Dr. F. HILLEL. pp. 52.
(J. Kauffmann, Frankfurt a/M.)

THE author of this little book places before us a classification of the nominal forms of the Mishnah, which, according to his opinion, was till recently not regarded as worthy of much attention on the part of philologists. But as no one ever attempted to deny that the language of the Mishnah is on the whole Hebrew—although, of course, greatly intermixed—it is not unnatural to conclude that the linguistic laws ruling the latter are also applicable to the former. Those parts of the language of the Mishnah which represent old Hebrew forms thus lose every peculiarity. Then there only remains a portion of nouns of later formation, which, of course, cannot be reduced directly to the Semitic primary forms. But it must not be overlooked that there occur in the Mishnah forms which are not found in the Bible, simply for the reason that there was no opportunity of using them. The inscriptions also give sufficient instances of this. But it is strange that the author seems not to have seen the recent books of Lagarde and Barth on the formation of Hebrew nouns, although the former and the first part of the latter appeared more than a year before his treatise. Barth, *e.g.*, refers frequently to forms of the noun found in the Mishnah [*Uebersicht, etc.*, pp. 130, 280, 290, 309, etc.], which means that from a philological point of view there is hardly any difference between the language of the Mishnah

and that of the Bible. The numerous remarks in which the author himself confesses that forms alluded to in his book occur also in classical Hebrew, proved to him that he could not bring forward much that was new. A kind of development is certainly visible in the language of the Mishnah, even if it lost much of its former freshness in the process, and shows unmistakable signs of degeneration. But if some forms are rare in the Bible, the *wenige Spuren* are sufficient to account for their existence, and their more frequent occurrence in the Mishnah only permits us to conclude that in later times they were in preference.

Calling attention to a few minor details, we may observe that *pl.* אִשְׁפָּתוֹת [from אִשְׁפָּתוֹת with sharpening of the second vowel, and *Dagesh* following] is Biblical, and occurs Lam. iv. 5; also תַּכְרִיךְ, Esth. viii. 15. The nouns גִּדּוּל, קִדּוּשׁ, רַחוּק are not forms *qatul* with lengthened second syllable, but forms *qatal* הֶקְטַל is rather הִקְטַל with *Imala* [darkening of the *a*-sound].

In other respects the little book shows industry and a praiseworthy knowledge of the subject, and it may be anticipated that future works of the author's pen will be valuable to students of Semitic philology.

H. HIRSCHFELD.

Maimonides' Commentar zum Tractat Kilajim, zum ersten Male herausgegeben, mit verbesserter Hebräischer Uebersetzung und mit Anmerkungen versehen. Von Dr. SALOMON BAMBERGER. 58 and 28 pp. (J. Kauffmann, Frankfurt a/M.) Also with a Hebrew title.

It is pleasing to note that the editions of single tractates of Maimonides' Arabic Commentary on the Mishnah have lately increased considerably. This path of investigation having been entered upon by very able authorities, it forms an appropriate task for younger students to follow in their footsteps. The above-mentioned latest edition is certainly not the worst, although one of the most difficult, because the editor had to make himself acquainted with a mass of abstruse names of plants and animals. It is unfortunate that the editor could not avail himself of the MSS. of the Bodleian Library at Oxford. It is all the more commendable that with such incomplete means at his disposal he succeeded in providing us with a serviceable text.

In addition I will make only a few suggestions. P. 2, l. 5, אֶלְכָּבוֹר is only a copyist's mistake for אֶלְכֹּזֶר, or rather אֶלְכֹּזֶרָה, see the